

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/674,173	PELHOS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Holly Rickman	1773	

All Participants:

(1) Holly Rickman.

(2) Ann Kulprathipanja.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 March 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
1,8,24

Prior art documents discussed:
none


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Ms. Kulprathipanja agreed to an examiner's amendment to add a critical feature to claim 24 (seedlayer is disclosed as being critical to invention) and to remove the term about from line 5 of each of claims 1 and 8 in order to more clearly define the invention.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)